

THE PLURALIS INTENSIVUS IN HEBREW

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

1904

BY

AARON EMBER

BALTIMORE, MD.

1905

THE PLURALIS INTENSIVUS IN HEBREW

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF UNIVERSITY STUDIES
OF THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY FOR
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF
PHILOSOPHY

1904



BY
AARON EMBER

BALTIMORE, MD.

1905

PREFACE.

The following pages are an abstract of the Second Part of my thesis, submitted to the Board of University Studies of the Johns Hopkins University for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. The material of the First Part, in which I have discussed the 'pluralis intensivus' in Assyrian, Arabic, Ethiopic, as well as in the Classical Languages and in some of the Modern Languages, and which contains also a general introduction to the 'pluralis intensivus' in Hebrew, I hope to publish in the near future. I take here the opportunity to express my indebtedness to my esteemed teacher, Professor Paul Haupt, for the valuable suggestions which he has given me in the preparation of this work. I am also greatly indebted to Professor Johnston, Dr. Foote and Dr. Blake. To Dr. Johnston and Dr. Foote I am especially thankful for the reading of the proof during my absence in Europe.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

THE PLURALIS INTENSIVUS IN HEBREW.

A. Plural Expressions for Natural Objects.

The 'pluralis intensivus' was in all probability employed at first to denote the wide phenomena of nature. Several phenomena in the universe were designated in Hebrew by plural expressions because they inspired the Hebrew mind with the idea of *greatness, majesty, grandeur, and holiness*. A correct understanding of the 'pluralis intensivus' becomes thus of great importance in reconstructing the cosmological ideas of the ancient Hebrews.

In several passages in the OT the plurals יַמִּים 'seas' and נְהָרוֹת 'rivers' are employed to designate The Universal Sea (Ὠκεανός), which was believed by the ancients to flow around the whole earth.¹ Cf. the Babylonian map in Notes on Ezekiel (SBOT) p. 100. We read in the beginning of Ps. 24 (vv. 1 and 2):

לִיהוָה הָאָרֶץ וּמְלוֹאָהּ תָּבֵל וְיֹשְׁבֵי בָהּ;
פִּי-יְהוָה עַל-יַמִּים יִסְדָּהּ וְעַל-נְהָרוֹת יִכְוֶנֶנָּה;

The world is JHVH's and the fulness thereof,
the world and they that dwell therein.

For He has founded it on The Great Sea (lit. *seas*)
and established it on The Great River (lit. *rivers*).

Duhm explains יַמִּים as a poetical plural for the prosaic יָם. Baethgen understands both יַמִּים and נְהָרוֹת as numerical plurals, referring the latter to the streams of the ocean (cf. Jon. 2, 4). These plurals must rather be explained as *intensive*, denoting *boundless extent*. See Notes on Ezekiel (Eng. transl.), p. 157, l. 22.

With regard to metre, the first section of the psalm (vv. 1-6) must be divided into three stanzas; each stanza comprises a couplet of two מִשְׁלִיִּם, i. e., double-hemistichs; each hemistich contains three beats. The couplet of two double-hemistichs, with three beats in each hemistich, is, according to Professor Haupt, the most common form of Hebrew poetry. See Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 163 (June, 1903), p. 54, col. 2. Cf. his

¹ Cf. the Chaldee paraphrase of Ecc. 1, 7: כָּל נְהִלָּא וּמִבְּעֵי מֵיָא אֶזְלִין וְנִגְדִין לְמִי אֻקְיִינוּס דְּמִסְחָר לַעֲלֵמָא כְּגוֹשְׁפִנְקָא 'All the rivers and streams of water run and flow into the Oceanus, which encircles the earth like a ring.'

remarks in Crit. Notes on Proverbs (SBOT) p. 33, l. 3, and *Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 19, last paragraph. The plural יַמִּים denotes The Universal Sea also in Gen. 1, 10; cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, ad locum.

In a number of passages the pl. יַמִּים = הַיָּם הַגָּדוֹל The Great Sea, *i. e.*, the Mediterranean; *e. g.*, Gen. 49, 13, זְבוּלֹן לְחוּף יַמִּים 'Zebulun will dwell on the shore of the great sea'; Judg. 5, 17, אֲשֶׁר יָשַׁב לְחוּף יַמִּים 'Asher sat still on the shore of the great sea'; cf. also Deut. 33, 19; Ezek. 26, 17; 27, 4; Dan. 11, 45. The pl. יַמִּים is sometimes employed poetically for the sing. יָם, especially in the phrase הוֹל יַמִּים 'the sand of the sea'; cf. Jer. 15, 8; Job 6, 3, etc.

In Pss. 137, 1 and 89, 25 the pl. נְהָרוֹת 'rivers' is equivalent to הַנָּהָר הַגָּדוֹל, *i. e.*, the Euphrates. We read in the first stanza of Ps. 137 (vv. 1 and 2):

שֵׁם יִשְׁבְּנוּ	עַל-נְהָרוֹת בָּבֶל
בְּזִכְרֵנוּ אֶת-צִיּוֹן :	גַּם בְּכִינוּ
תְּלִינוּ בְּנְוֹתֵינוּ :	עַל-עֲרֵבִים בְּתוֹכָהּ

By Babel's River
And tears were shedding
On willows there

there we sat
on Zion thinking,
our harps we hung.

The psalm falls into triplets of double-hemistichs, each hemistich containing two beats (2+2).

Ps. 89, 26.

וְשִׁמְתִּי בְיָם יָדוֹ וּבְנְהָרוֹת יְמִינוֹ :

I will lay his hand on the sea,
on The Great River his right hand.

This verse pictures the ideal boundaries of the Davidic Kingdom. It is to extend from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates.¹

The plural נְהָרוֹת in these two passages is explained by some modern scholars² to mean the Euphrates and its canals regarded as branches. Duham reads the sing. נָהָר in the second passage. The most probable explanation of the plural form נְהָרוֹת is, however, that it is *intensive* = The Great River, *i. e.*, the Euphrates.³

¹ Cf. Josh. 1, 4.

² Baethgen and others.

³ See Haupt's note in Wellhausen's translation of the Psalms, p. 182, l. 30.

According to Haupt,¹ אֲשֶׁר מֵעֵבֶר לְנַהֲרֵי כוּשׁ Is. 18, 1 means *beyond the Great River Cush, i. e., the upper course of the Nile.*²

In the same way Haupt explains יַאֲרֵי מִצְרַיִם (or יַאֲרֵי מִצְוֹר) Is. 7, 18; 19, 6; 37, 25 to mean *The Great River of Egypt, i. e., the Nile.*³ Compare also יַאֲרֵיהֶם Ps. 78, 44. According to Marti (*Buch Jesaja*, p. 153) and others⁴ the pl. יַאֲרִים is used of the branches of the Delta. It is better, however, to explain it as *pluralis intensivus*. In Ezek. 29, 3–5 both the singular and the plural are employed to designate the Nile. Toy (in SBOT) is inclined to change the plurals to singulars, but this is unnecessary, as they may be explained as *intensive.*⁵ Compare Ezek. 30, 12.

In a number of passages in the OT (Ex. 15, 5. 8; Is. 63, 13; 78, 15; 106, 9) תְּהוֹמוֹת (pl. of תְּהוֹם 'abyss,' 'deep')⁶ is *pluralis intensivus*, = The Great Deep. In nearly all these passages the plural refers to the Red Sea. In Ps. 78, 15 it is used of the subterranean waters.⁷

Ps. 106, 9.

וַיִּגְזֹר בְּיַם־סוּף וַיִּהְיֶה וַיּוֹלִיכֵם בְּתִהְמוֹת כַּמֶּדְבָּר :

He rebuked the Red Sea and it was dried up,
He led them through the Great Deep as through pasture land.

Ex. 15, 3–5.⁸

יְהוָה שְׁמוֹ :	אֵשׁ מִלַּחְמָה ³
יְרַח בָּיִם	פְּרָעָה וַחֲיִלָּה ⁴

טָבַעַר בְּיַם־סוּף :	וּמִבְּחַר שְׁלִשִׁי
יָרְדוּ בַּמַּצּוֹלֹתֵי :	תְּהוֹמוֹת יַם־סוּף ⁵

כִּמְרֵי אֵב (γ) 5

מִרְכַּבָּת (β) 4

יְהוָה (α) 3

¹ See Crit. Notes on Isaiah (SBOT), p. 108, ll. 50 ff.

² Cf. the article on Cush in Cheyne-Black's EB and Cheyne's *Critica Biblica*.

³ Cf. Egyptian 'io(t)r'o' the great river, i. e., the Nile.

⁴ Cf. W. Max Müller's article on the Nile in Cheyne-Black's EB.

⁵ יָם 'sea' is used of the Euphrates and the Nile. The Babylonians called the Persian Gulf nāru marratu.

⁶ Cf. Assyr. tiāmtu, tāmdu, tāmdu.

⁷ Cf. Gen. 49, 25 'the deep that coucheth beneath.'

⁸ I have followed the text and translation of this passage given by Professor Haupt in his article, "Moses' Song of Triumph," *AJS*, Vol. XX, No. 3, pp. 149–72.

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 3 | A man of warfare | JHVH His name is, |
| 4 | The king and his army | He cast in the sea; |

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| | His choicest charioteers | were whelmed in the Red Sea, |
| 5 | Engulfed by the Ocean, | they sank in the deep. |

In Ps. 78, 15 the pl. תְּהוֹמוֹת is joined to the singular attribute רֶבֶה, and is employed for the more common form תְּהוֹם רֶבֶה (Gen. 7, 11; 49, 25).

Ps. 78, 15.

יִבְקַע צִירִים בְּמַדְבָּר וַיִּשֶׁק פְּתָהוֹמוֹת רֶבֶה:

He clave rocks in the desert, He gave them to drink as from
the Great Deep.

Most modern exegetes¹ believe that רֶבֶה is not co-ordinated to תְּהוֹמוֹת, but is employed adverbially; *cf.*, however, אֲלֵהִים קָשָׁה Is. 19, 4 and אֱלֹהִים צָדִיק Ps. 7, 10. The LXX and Jerome understood it as an attribute of תְּהוֹמוֹת. Graetz suggests עֲרֵבָה for רֶבֶה. I believe, however, that it is preferable to explain the plural as *intensivus*. With the *intensive* use of the pl. תְּהוֹמוֹת compare אֶרֶץ תְּהוֹמוֹת Is. 44, 23; אֶרֶץ תְּהוֹמוֹת Ezek. 26, 20; 32, 18, 24; בּוֹר תְּהוֹמוֹת Ps. 88, 7; מַעְמָקִים Is. 51, 10; Ps. 69, 3, 15; 130, 1; מִצּוֹלוֹת Ex. 15, 5; Mich. 7, 19; Ps. 68, 23; 88, 7; Neh. 9, 11.

In several passages in the OT (Ps. 87, 1; 110, 3²) the Temple Mount is denoted by הַרְרֵי קֹדֶשׁ 'the holy mountains' (lit. *the mountains of holiness*), *i. e.*, The Great Holy Mountain.³ Compare הַרְרֵי צִיּוֹן Ps. 133, 3; הַרְרֵי שְׁמֶרֶן Am. 3, 9; עֲרֵי קֹדֶשׁ (of Jerusalem) Is. 64, 9.⁴

The pl. הַרְמוֹנִים Ps. 42, 7, lit. 'the Hermons' is *intensivus*, being equivalent to The Gigantic Hermon.⁵ The plural is usually explained, however, to refer to the triple peaks of Mount Hermon.⁶ If this explanation is correct it would be rather a strange way of

¹ Baethgen, Duhm, Haupt, etc.; see also Gesenius-Kautzsch², p. 435, footnote 2.

² In this passage we must read (with Symm. and Jerome) הַרְרֵי for הַרְרֵי.

³ Cf. Dietrich, *Abhandlungen zur hebr. Grammatik*, p. 28, below; Baethgen, *Psalmen*, p. 264.

⁴ Cf. on עֲרֵי יְהוּדָה Isa. 40, 9, p. 227.

⁵ Cf. Dietrich, *Abhandlungen zur hebr. Grammatik*, p. 18; Haupt's note in Wellhausen's translation of the Psalms (in SBOT) p. 182, l. 30.

⁶ Smith, *The Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, New York, 1895, p. 477, note 1; Baethgen, Duhm, etc.

expressing the several peaks of Mt. Hermon. The explanation is forced and very improbable. The plural is more likely *intensive*, denoting the gigantic size of the mountain.

We shall now discuss the *intensive* use of the various plural expressions in Hebrew denoting 'heaven,' especially שָׁמַיִם,¹ which is the most common of these terms. Before doing this, however, it will be necessary to consider the question as to whether the idea of a plurality of heavens was familiar to the ancient Hebrews. Some scholars² have recently answered this in the affirmative, on the following grounds, viz.: (a) the conception of a sevenfold division of the heavens among the Babylonians; (b) the invariable use of the pl. form שָׁמַיִם, the general word for 'heaven' in Hebrew; but more especially, (c) the phrase 'the heaven of heavens' (שָׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם) which occurs in several passages in the OT (Deut. 10, 14; 1 Ki. 8, 27; Ps. 148, 4).

These grounds are, however, by no means convincing; they are not even quite correct. There is really no explicit reference to a series of heavens in the Assyro-Babylonian Literature; still less to a sevenfold division of the heavens.³ The meaning of the so-called 7 tubuqâti⁴ is by no means certain; while the plural forms šame and šamâmu in themselves do not prove anything, inasmuch as they may be explained as *intensive plurals*. Nor does the invariable use of pl. שָׁמַיִם prove the correctness of the affirmative view, as the pl., like šame and šamâmu, may be *intensive*. If the pl. שָׁמַיִם be numerical, it is rather difficult to understand why the first word of the phrase שָׁמַיִם הַשָּׁמַיִם 'the heaven of heavens' (which is explained by those who favor the affirmative reply to mean 'the highest heaven') should be in the plural. A careful examination of the individual passages in which שָׁמַיִם is found will show almost conclusively that in many instances the plural cannot be numerical, *e. g.*, Is. 40, 22, הַנּוֹטָה

¹ The form שָׁמַיִם is to be explained with Haupt (see Crit. Notes on Isaiah (SBOT), p. 157, ll. 18 ff.) as a remnant of the old 'plural of the accusative.' The oldest form must have been šamâma. By dissimilation we get šamâmi, and by epenthesis of the final *i* we have šamâimi, from which, by dropping the final short vowel, we get šamâim. In the same way we must explain the plurals מַיִם, צְהָרִים, עֲרָבִים, and מַחֲנִים (Cant. 1.1). Cf. Haupt, *Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902) p. 57, n. on מַחֲנִים; cf. also Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT), p. 270, n. 4, and the references there given.

² Cf. Salmond's article on 'Heaven' in Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. 2, p. 321b, below; Cremer's article on *Himmel* in Herzog's *Realencyclopädie*, and KAT³, p. 615. See also Duhm, *Psalmen*, p. 300, n. on Ps. 148, 4, and Baethgen, *Psalmen*, p. 432, n. on the same passage.

³ See KAT³, p. 615, second paragraph.

⁴ *Ibid.*

שָׁמַיִם כְּכֹחַ שָׁמַיִם *that stretcheth out heaven as a curtain.* If שָׁמַיִם were a numerical plural we should expect כְּכֹחַ שָׁמַיִם *as curtains.* The pl. שָׁמַיִם is moreover frequently employed in parallelism with the sing. רָקִיעַ 'firmament.' For example, we read at the beginning of Ps. 19:

כְּבוֹד אֵל	הַשָּׁמַיִם מִסְפָּרִים
מִגִּיד הָרָקִיעַ :	וּמִעֲשֵׂה יָדָיו

The heavens declare	the glory of God,
And the firmament proclaims	his handiwork.

In Gen. 1, 8 it is stated וַיִּקְרָא אֱלֹהִים לָרָקִיעַ שָׁמַיִם *And God called the firmament Heaven.*

But the evidence which is most decidedly in favor of the affirmative reply is said to be the phrase 'the heaven of heavens.' I believe, however, that the meaning usually given to this phrase is incorrect. It does not denote that there are a number of distinct heavens, but refers rather to the immeasurable reaches in the heavenly space. The expression imparts a superlative idea, denoting heaven in the broadest sense, as extending to the uttermost heavenly limits, as in the somewhat similar English expression 'heaven piled on heavens.'¹

There is, therefore, no clear evidence that the conception of a series of heavens is found in the OT,² the evidence being rather in favor of the negative view. The plural form does not designate distinct heavens of various elevations; nor is there inherent in the plural 'the idea of a whole composed of innumerable separate points,'³ or, as Ewald states it, that the plural is used as one of the names of regions that are 'infinitely divisible.' It is best explained as *pluralis intensivus*, denoting *boundless extent and majesty*, designating *the great and majestic heaven*. Of course, this was only the original force of the plural. In the course of

¹ Cf. Henry D. Northrop, *Earth, Sea, and Sky*, p. 794.

² The idea of a plurality of heavens is, however, very common in the Rabbinical Literature, and in the Apocalyptic and other pseudepigraphic books, both Jewish and Christian. The conception was probably borrowed from the Persians. Rabbinical and apocryphal literature speaks of seven or ten heavens. Cf. Hagigah 12b; Kautzsch, "Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments," II, 121; Charles, "Book of the Secrets of Enoch," pp. xxx *et seq.* Cf. also Slavonic Enoch, viii. 1; II Cor., xii, 2 *et seq.*; Ex. R. xxxi, 4. There are also the seven heavens of Mohammed. The cabalists likewise speak of seven heavens, each rising in happiness above the other.

³ *Lehr. d. hebr. Spr.*, p. 410.

time, however, the plural lost a great deal of its original *intensive* force, and came to mean simply 'heaven.'¹ This explains its general occurrence in ordinary prose.²

With שמים compare Assy. šame and šamâmu (the singular šamû being uncommon), Palm. בעל(שמים), Syr. مَعْنَى, Arabic له ما في السموات وما في الأرض. Cf. Coran, 2, 256. Saadya, however, often translates Hebr. שמים³ by the singular, e. g. he renders Gen. 1, 1 אֵל מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ and the Ethiopic Bible has baqadâmi gabra Egzi'abher šamâia uamedra. Cf. Barth in ZDMG 42, 341.

The plural מְרוֹמִים (from a stem רום 'to be high') 'heights' is in a number of passages employed as a synonym of 'שמים'. Cf. Is. 33, 16; Job 16, 19; 25, 2; 31, 2; Ps. 148, 1; Ecc. 10, 6.

Similarly, the plurals עֲלִיּוֹת and מַעְלֹת (from the stem עלה 'to go up') 'upper stories' are employed as names for the boundless heavenly regions, regarded as the abode of God.⁵

Ps. 104, v. 3.

הַמַּקְרָה בַּמַּיִם עֲלִיּוֹתָיו הַשָּׁם עָבִים רְנוּבוֹ;

Who places the beams of His Great Upper Story in the waters
Who makes the clouds His chariot.

The pl. עֲלִיּוֹת is *intensive*, denoting *greatness*, *majesty*, and *holiness*. Wellhausen renders it by the plural, and refers the 'upper stories' to the *seven heavens*.⁶ This rendering would be correct if we could prove that the conception of a plurality of heavens was familiar to the Hebrews.

¹ The etymology of שמים is uncertain. Hommel, followed by Prof. Haupt (see Crit. Notes on Isaiah [in SBOT], p. 157), explains it as a causative form of מים 'water.' In support of this view cf. especially Jensen in KB 6, 486, ad l. 47. A somewhat similar explanation is found in the Babylonian Talmud, Hagigah 12a: מֵה שְׁמַיִם אָמַר רַבִּי יוֹסִי בֶן חֲנִינְיָה שֶׁשָּׁם מַיִם.

² Cf. Kimchi's note on Gen. 1, 8. Its synonyms מְרוֹמִים, עֲלִיּוֹת (Ps. 104, 3, 13) and מַעְלֹת (Am. 9, 6) point, however, to the correctness of the older derivation from an unused stem שמה (Arab. سبأ) 'to be high,' unless the stem سبأ be denominative.

³ Cf. Ethiopic pl. 'a rîâm.

⁴ Cf. Dietrich, *Abhandlungen zur hebr. Grammatik*, p. 19.

⁵ Gesenius-Kautsch²⁷, p. 402b.

⁶ Cf. Notes on Psalms (Eng. trans.), p. 203, l. 41.

Ibid., v. 13.

משקה הרים מעלותיו מפרי מעשך תשבע הארץ:

Who waters the mountains from His Great Upper Story,
From the fruit of Thy works is the earth satisfied.

Am. 9, v. 6.

הבונה בשמים מעלותיו ואגדתו על־ארץ יסדה
הקורא למי הים וישפכם על־פני הארץ:

Who buildeth His Great Upper Story in heaven,
And His vault over the earth He hath founded;
Who calleth for the waters of the sea,
And over the face of the earth He poureth them out.

Here the pl. **מעלות** is used in parallelism with the sing. **אגדה**; the plural is *intensive*. Cf. Dietrich, *Abhandlungen zur hebr. Grammatik*, p. 19.

B. Plural Expressions for Mythological Monsters.

Throughout the OT we find frequent allusions to a mythological monster or dragon who was supposed to inhabit the Deep. This sea-monster is referred to as *Rahab* (**רהב**), *Leviathan* (**לוייתן**), or simply as 'the monster' (**התנין**). In the passages in which the mythological monster is alluded to we have an echo of the old Babylonian myth of *Tiāmat* (Heb. **תהום**), a female dragon who personified the Primeval Ocean. See Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895), especially pp. 81–86; KAT², pp. 509–511.

This monstrous dragon is in several passages designated by the plural. The plural is the same which is employed to denote natural objects, inasmuch as the sea-dragon, just as *Tiāmat* in the Babylonian myth, was originally a personification of the primeval ocean-flood. Before discussing the several passages in which the mythological monster is denoted by plural expressions it may perhaps be advisable to refer to the most important passages in the OT in which he is undoubtedly alluded to.

Am. 9, 3:

And though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out thence, and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will I command the dragon, and he shall bite them.

In several passages allusions are made to a contest of JHVH with the mythological monster in primeval times, *e. g.*, Is. 51, 9:

Awake, awake, put on strength, O arm of JHVH!
Awake as in the days of old, the generations of ancient times!
Was it not Thou who didst shatter¹ Rahab, pierced the dragon?

In Job 7, 12 we read:

Am I the sea or dragon
That thou settest a watch over me?

In the last passage the sea is personified as a dragon, and brings to mind the Babylonian myth of Tiāmat.

Again in Job 26, 12 we read:

With his power he stirred up the sea,
And by his understanding he shattered Rahab.
By his spirit heaven was made bright;
His hand has pierced the fugitive serpent.

In this passage the piercing of the dragon is connected with the fashioning of heaven, and it reminds us of the Babylonian myth in which Marduk splits the carcass of the female dragon Tiāmat in two, out of one part making heaven, and out of the other, earth.² These examples are sufficient to show that we have unmistakable allusions to a mythological sea-monster in the OT. The several passages in which this monster is denoted by plural expressions will now be discussed.

According to Ps. 74, 13, 14 the contest of JHVH with the mythological dragon had taken place in remote antiquity, before the creation of the earth, in which the dragon was slain. The pl. תַּנִּינִים v. 13 is best explained as *intensive*, equal to The Huge Dragon. The pl. רֶאשִׁים in vv. 13 and 14 may be taken as *numerical*, referring to the fact that the monster was conceived as having more than one head; it may, however, also be explained as *intensive*, equal to The Great Head. In v. 14b read with Hitzig and Wellhausen³ לָעַס for אָלַם. The passage is in 2 + 2 metre, as follows:

¹ Read (with Houbigant, Lagarde, Cheyne, etc.) הַמְחַצֵּת for אֶת הַמְחַצֵּת, as in Job 26. 26.

² Cf. *Babylonian Creation-Story*, Book IV, ll. 129-142.

³ See Crit. Notes on Psalms (SBOT), p. 89, l. 46.

בַּעֲדָה יָם	אַתָּה פִּוְרַתָּ 13
תַּנְיָנִים עַל-הַמַּיִם :	שִׁבְרַתָּ רֹאשִׁי
רֹאשֵׁי לִוְיָתָן	אַתָּה רִצַּצְתָּ
לֶעֶס לְצִיָּים :	תַּחֲנוּנוֹ בַּאֲכָל

Thou hast smashed
Thou hast broken the heads
Thou hast crushed
Thou hast given it for food

with thy strength the sea,
of the huge dragon upon the waters.
the heads of Leviathan,
as meat to the wild beasts.

In this passage *יָם*, *תַּנְיָנִים*, and *לִוְיָתָן* are synonymous terms for the mythological sea-dragon. That the pl. *תַּנְיָנִים* refers to one monster is shown by its being used in parallelism with *יָם*. Cf. Job 7, 12. The whole passage alludes to the contest of JHVH with the mythological sea-dragon, and not as Baethgen and others maintain,¹ to the drowning of the Egyptian host in the Red Sea. Cf. on this passage KAT³, p. 507 f., and 511.

In Ps. 89, 11 Rahab is referred to as *אֹיְבִים* 'enemies,' i. e., The Great Enemy (of God).

כָּהַלְלָה רָהַב	אַתָּה דָּפַאֲתָ
בְּיָדְךָ אֹיְבֶיךָ :	בְּרוּזָה עֶזְךָ

Thou didst crush Rahab
With thy strong arm

as a dishonored corpse,²
thou didst scatter thy great enemy.

The last hemistich means *Thou didst scatter the bones of Thy great enemy to the four winds*; cf. Ps. 53, 6. According to Duhm, Gunkel, and others, we have in the pl. *אֹיְבֶיךָ* an allusion to the *helpers of Rahab* mentioned in Job 9, 13.³ This is rather forced. Still less likely is the view of Baethgen and others who interpret the passage (as also Ps. 74, 13, 14; cf. preceding page) of the drowning of the Egyptian host in the Red Sea. The poet is speaking of primeval times, and v. 11 refers to the contest of JHVH with the mythological monster, which took place before the creation of the world.

בְּהֵמוֹת 'beasts' (Job 40, 15–24; Is. 30, 6) = The Colossal Beast. It is advocated by modern critics that *בְּהֵמוֹת*, the animal

¹ Cf. Wellhausen's *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, part 6, p. 179.

² For the rendering of *כָּהַלְלָה* see Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895), p. 33, n. 3.

³ Cf. KAT³, p. 511.

which is poetically described in Job 40, 15–24¹ is a Hebraized form of an Egyptian word for the *hippopotamus* (p-ehe-mau ‘water-ox’),² but there does not seem to be any philological basis for this view. Moreover, it is more than doubtful whether such a word as p-ehe-mau exists at all in Egyptian (F. C. Cook). It is preferable to explain בְּהֵמוֹת as the plural form of בְּהֵמָה ‘beast,’ and in the passage under consideration the plural is not *numerical*, but *intensive*, and means The Colossal Beast or The Colossal Monster.

As to what special animal was intended in the description the authorities vary. Sa’adya translated *Behemoth* by the Arabic word for the *rhinoceros*. Shultens identified it with the elephant.³ Most modern exegetes, however, think that the *hippopotamus* is the animal intended, and there is really nothing in the description which does not well apply to this animal. But while it is true that the poet is giving us a description of some real animal which existed at his time, there are some elements in the description which seem to require a mythological explanation,⁴ and which lead us to suppose that originally *Behemoth* was the name of a mythological monster, and was later transformed to some real, colossal animal (probably the hippopotamus). So that we have in the description a fusion of the real characteristics of the hippopotamus with some mythological conceptions of a mythical dragon. The poet did not have in mind a distinct mythological being, but the description has a mythological basis. The passage which especially invites a mythological explanation is verse 19, in which Gunkel (*Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 62) reads: הָעֵשׂוּי יֵגֵשׁ הָרָבּוּ for הָעֵשׂוּי יֵגֵשׁ הָרָבּוּ. The verse according to Gunkel reads therefore:

הָיָא רִאשִׁית הַדְרֵי-אֵל הָעֵשׂוּי יֵגֵשׁ הָרָבּוּ :

He is the firstling of the ways of God,
Created that he may rule the dry land.

According to Gunkel both *Leviathan* (the description of whom in Job follows immediately after that of Behemoth) and *Behemoth*

¹ This passage is considered by Cheyne (*Job and Solomon*, p. 56), Dillmann, Kuenen, Ewald, Duhm, and others as having been inserted in the original poem by a later hand.

² Cf. Ewald, *Das Buch Hiob*, p. 317; Dillmann, *Hiob*, p. 344; Duhm, *Hiob*, p. 196; and others have held the same opinion, following Jablonsky and Sholz.

³ Alb. Schultens, *Liber Jobi cum nova versione ad Hebr. fontem et commentario perpetuo*, Leiden 1737, pp. 1146–1149.

⁴ Cf. Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 62 ff.

are primarily Babylonian, mythical dragons. He identifies *Leviathan* with *Tiāmat*, the dragon of the Deep, and *Behemoth*, the lord of the dry land, he identifies with *Kingu*, the consort of *Tiāmat*.¹ But, whatever may be said of the mythological interpretation of the passage, one thing seems to be certain: בְּהֵמוֹת is not a Hebraized form of Egyptian p-ehe-mau, but the plural of the common Hebrew word for 'beast.' It is *pluralis intensivus*, meaning The Colossal Beast.

The second passage in which בְּהֵמוֹת is employed as *pluralis intensivus* is Is. 30, 6 (about 703 B. C.), in the expression מִשְׁאֵל בְּהֵמוֹת נֶגֶב which should be rendered 'Oracle of the great monster (Behemoth) of the south land.' This is the heading of a fragmentary prophecy on Egypt. *Behemoth* is here used, as *Rahab* in v. 7 and several other passages in the OT, as a symbol for Egypt.² נֶגֶב designates here Egypt, as in Dan. 8, 9; 11, 5 ff. The fragmentary prophecy consists of only two verses (vv. 7 and 8) which may be rendered as follows:

Through a land of distress and difficulty whence come lioness and lion, viper and dragon, they carry their wealth upon the back of young asses, and their treasures on the humps of camels, to a nation that profits nothing. And Egypt—vain and empty—is their help; therefore do I name this: *Rahab the Silenced*.³

Delitzsch finds a reference to the monster Behemoth also in Ps. 73, 22:

וְאֲנִי-בֶּעֶר וְלֹא אֶדָּע בְּהֵמוֹת הָרִחִי עִמָּךְ:

which he renders:

Ich wär' ein Dummer und verstandlos,
Ein Untier wär' ich gegen dich.

I should be a foolish one, without understanding,
I should be a monster before thee.

While I believe that the pl. בְּהֵמוֹת in this passage is probably *intensive*, I do not think that it contains any allusion to the animal described in Job 40, 15–24. From the fact that it is used

¹ See KAT³, p. 511.

² Cf. the bear as symbol of Russia, the lion of England, etc.

³ Reading (with Heusler, Gunkel, Budde, Cheyne, and others) רַהַב הַמְשֻׁבָּת for רַהַב הַמְשֻׁבָּת, Duhm reads רַהַב הַמְשֻׁבָּת *Rahab of the wastes*, and Marti conjectures בְּהֵמוֹת נֶגֶב.

in parallelism with בַּעַר 'stupid,' 'brutish,' the meaning of the word must be something like *a most stupid beast*. The plural is here employed to intensify the stupidity and ignorance of the beast.

Graetz, who never hesitated to make gratuitous conjectures reads תְּבוּנֹת חֲסִדִּי 'I was devoid of understanding' for תְּבוּנֹת הַיָּדִי. Wellhausen substitutes the singular; so, too, Duhm. For the plural cf. Crit. Notes on Proverbs, p. 40, l. 50; see below, p. 228.

C. Plural Expressions for Deities and the Appurtenances of God.

Various theories have been advanced to explain the use of the plural form אֱלֹהִים as a designation of the God of Israel.¹ Least plausible is the view of the old theologians, beginning with Peter Lombard (12th century), that we have in the plural form a reference to the Trinity.² Some modern scholars explain it as a relic of an earlier polytheism. This view was advanced by Bau-dissin,³ Meyer,⁴ Hermann Schultz,⁵ Ewald,⁶ Renan,⁷ W. Robertson Smith,⁸ and others. As to how, according to this view, the originally numerical plural came to be employed to designate a single deity Robertson Smith gave the following explanation (*The Religion of the Semites*, p. 445):

The *Elohim* of a place originally meant all its sacred denizens, viewed collectively as an indeterminate sum of indistinguishable beings, the transition to the use of the plural in a singular sense would follow naturally, as soon as this indeterminate conception gave way to the conception of an individual god of the sanctuary.⁹

¹ The plural *Elohim* is in several passages (Judges 11, 24; 1 Ki. 11, 5; 2 Ki. 1, 2, etc.) also employed to designate single heathen deities.

² Cf. Deyling, *Observat.*, II, pp. 16. 17.

³ *Semitische Religions-Geschichte* (Leipzig, 1876), I, pp. 55-65.

⁴ *Geschichte des Alterthums*, Vol. I, p. 376.

⁵ *Alttestamentliche Theologie* (Göttingen, 1889), p. 110.

⁶ *Geschichte Israels*, 3 Aufl., II, 56.

⁷ *Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, I, p. 85 f.

⁸ *Religion of the Semites* (London, 1894), p. 445.

⁹ The polytheistic explanation of אֱלֹהִים can be traced back to Talmudic times. But the polytheists of the Talmud based their polytheism rather on the fact that אֱלֹהִים is sometimes construed with a plural verb than on the plural form of אֱלֹהִים itself. We read in the Babylonian Talmud (Sanhedrin, 386): "Rabbi Johanan said: whenever in a Biblical passage the heretics seem to find a support for their polytheism, their refutation is always nearby. If it be said (Gen. 1, 26) 'Let us make (נַעֲשֶׂה pl.) man in our image,' it is added 'and God created (וַיַּבְרָא sing.) man in his image'; (*ibid.* 11, 7) 'Let us go down (נֵרְדָּה pl.) and let us confound (וְנַבְלֶה pl.) their language,' however (*ibid.* 11, 15) 'And the Lord came

The usage of the language, however, gives no support to this theory. That the language of the OT has entirely given up the idea of plurality in אֱלֹהִים (as applied to the God of Israel) is especially shown by the fact that it is almost invariably construed with a singular verbal predicate, and takes a singular adjectival attribute. I say with Nöldeke that "even if there should be in the plural form some trace of polytheism, it would only point to polytheistic ideas in old, prehistoric times. But this is not at all likely."¹ אֱלֹהִים must rather be explained as an *intensive plural*, denoting *greatness* and *majesty*, being equal to The Great God. It ranks with the plurals אֲדָנִים and בְּעָלִים, employed with reference to human beings. Cf. Assy. *ilāni* 'gods' as *pluralis intensivus*; Phoen. אֱלֵם used in a singular sense; Ethiop. 'amlāk (plural of the unused sing. mālēk 'King') employed as the general name for 'God.'

In the same way a number of other plurals are used in a singular sense when employed to designate the 'Deity.' The most common of these are:² אֲדָנִים 'Lord,' Mal. 1, 6 (especially common with suffixes); קְדוּשִׁים *the Most Holy*, Hos. 12, 1; Prov. 9, 10; 30, 3, and probably also Job 15, 15 (cf. אֱלֹהִים קְדוּשִׁים Josh. 24, 19); Aramaic עֲלִיזָן *the Most High*, Dan. 7, 18. 22. 25. 27; in Dan. 4, 23 the pl. שָׁמַיָא 'heavens' is used as a name of God.

In Job 34, 18 נְדִיבִים 'nobles' is *pluralis intensivus*, equal to The Exceedingly Noble, *i. e.*, God.³ Job complained that God had afflicted him unjustly, and he also questioned the justice of God in the ruling of the Universe. Elihu replies that injustice is inconsistent with the very idea of God; he says (Job 34, 17. 19):

down (יֵרֵד sing.) to see the city and the tower'; (*ibid.* 35, 7) 'For then God appeared (נִגְלָה pl.) unto him,' however (*ibid.* 35, 3) 'who answered (הֵעֲנָה sing.) me in the day of my distress'; (Deut. 4, 7) 'For what nation is there so great who has God so nigh (אֱלֹהִים pl.) as JHVH our God in all things that we call upon him (אֱלֹהִים sing.) for'; (2 Sam. 7, 23) 'And what one nation upon the earth is like thy people, like Israel whom God went (הִלָּךְ pl.) to redeem for a people for *himself*' (לֹךְ sing.); (Dan. 7, 9) 'The thrones (כִּסְאוֹת pl.) were set, and *one ancient* (עָתִיק sing.) of days sat down' (יָתֵב sing.). But why employ the plural at all? This is in accordance with Rabbi Johanan, who said: 'The Holy One, blessed be He! never does anything before consulting the heavenly household, as we read (Dan. 4, 14) 'By the decree of the watchers in this matter, and by the word of the holy ones.'"

¹ Nöldeke, Review of Baethgen's *Beiträge zur semit. Religionsgeschichte* in ZDMG, Vol. XLII, p. 476; "selbst wenn darin etwas Polytheismus steckte, so könnte das doch nur für uralte, vorgeschichtliche Zeiten gelten. Aber nicht einmal dies ist irgend wahrscheinlich."

² Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch²⁷, pp. 404, 405.

³ Comp. Delitzsch, *Das Buch Hiob* (1902), p. 173, note on 34, 18.

וְאִם-צָדִיק פֶּבֶר תִּרְשִׁיעַ :	17 הֲאֶ-שׁוֹנֵא מִשְׁפָּט יִחְבֹּשׁ
רָשָׁע אֶל נְדִיבִים :	18 הֲאֶמֶר לַמֶּלֶךְ בְּלִיעַל
וְלֹא נִפְרִשׁוֹעַ לַפְּנֵי-הָהָל	19 אֲשֶׁר-לֹא נָשָׂא פְּנֵי-שָׂרִים
.	כִּי-מַעֲשֵׂה יָדָיו כָּלֵם

- 34, 17 Is it possible that he who hateth justice should rule,
And wilt thou condemn the Righteous One, the Mighty One?
18 Can one say unto the King (*i. e.*, God) "Worthless One,"
Or "Wicked One" unto *The Exceedingly Noble*,
19 Who showeth no partiality to princes,
Nor regardeth the opulent before the poor,
Because they are all the works of His hands?"

Budde and Duhm read with the LXX הָאֶמֶר for הָאֶמֶר (v. 18). According to them the meaning of the verse is: How can you (Job) condemn God who says even to a king 'worthless one,' or 'wicked ones' to princes? But if this were the meaning of the verse we should expect the pl. רָשָׁעִים instead of the singular. Both the context and the grammatical construction show that the pl. נְדִיבִים is *intensivus*, like אֱלֹהִים and קְדוּשִׁים, and refers to God. In Ecc. 5, 7 גְּבוּהִים is *pluralis intensivus*, and means The Most High, *i. e.*, God. Before discussing, however, this much disputed plural it will be necessary to make a few preliminary remarks with regard to the meaning and position of vv. 7 and 8. These two verses must be explained, with Haupt, as a misplaced polemical gloss to the beginning of ch. 4 where we read (vv. 1-3):

And when I saw time and again the oppressions which are done under the sun, and behold! the tears of the oppressed with no one to comfort them; in the hands of their oppressors power with no one to right them. Then I praised the dead which were dead long ago more than the living that are living yet. And better than both of them is he who does not yet exist, who has not seen the evil work that is done under the sun.

These are very pessimistic statements, and the glossator who wrote vv. 7 and 8 of ch. 5 tried to show that the statements of Ecclesiastes are very much exaggerated. There is not so much oppression as he claims, because if an official commits an injustice he is checked by a superior official, and the latter is called to account by a still higher magistrate, and so on up to the king who is at the head of the complicated system of government. Here a theologian added a tertiary gloss וְגִבְהִים עֲלֵיהֶם and the

¹ Read הָאֶמֶר for הָאֶמֶר; cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch²⁷, p. 349, n. 2.

Most High (i. e., God) is above them, i. e., the Most High is above the king and all his subordinate officials. The two verses may be rendered as follows:

If you see the oppression of a poor man and the deprivation of justice and equity in a province, do not be alarmed at the matter, for there is a higher one watching over the high one [*and the Most High is over them*]. And after all (בכל) it is an advantage to a land to have a king, (especially) in a cultivated region (i. e., in a civilized community).

The meaning of the last verse is: in spite of several undeniable drawbacks it is an advantage to a civilized community to have a king.

The word גְּבוּהִים has given a great deal of difficulty with regard to its rendering and precise allusion. The LXX translates v. 7b by ὑψηλὸς ἐπάνω ὑψηλοῦ φυλάσσει, καὶ ὑψηλοὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς superior watches over superior, and superiors (גְּבוּהִים) again over them. The rendering of the Vulgate is *excelso excelsior est alius, et super hos quoque eminentiores sunt alii*. So also the Syriac Version, Rashbam, Luther, Herzfeld, Ginsburg, Wright, Wildeboer, etc. Gill and Holden think that the pl. גְּבוּהִים designates the Trinity. The latter paraphrases גְּבוּהִים עֲלֵיהֶם thus: *there are the High Ones of the Holy Trinity above the princes of the earth and the hierarchy of heaven*. Ibn Ezra refers גְּבוּהִים to angels. Rosenmüller, Knobel, Ewald, Elster, Zöckler, etc., interpret גְּבוּהִים as a plural of majesty, and refer it to God. This seems to be the correct explanation, and it has therefore been adopted in the present discussion. The Targum incorrectly takes the first גְּבוּהָ to mean God. Knobel's assertion that the Targum refers גְּבוּהִים to God is incorrect.¹

A number of participles from לָהֹלֵם stems having the plural form, and employed as attributes of God, are generally regarded as doubtful cases of 'plurals of majesty,' inasmuch as they may also be explained as singulars.² These are עֲשֵׂי my Maker, Job 35, 10; עֲשֵׂי thy Maker, Is. 54, 5; עֲשֵׂי his Maker, Ps. 149, 2;

¹ The text and translation of the Chaldee paraphrase of v. 7b is as follows: אֲרוֹם אֵל אֲדִיר עַל שָׁמַי מְרוֹמָא נְטִיר עֻבְדָּא בְּנֵי אֲנָשָׁא בֶן טָב לְבִשְׁתָּא וּמִן קַדְמֹי מִשְׁתַּלְחִין גִּיבְרִין נוֹטְרִין וְתַקִּיפִין לְמַדְרֵי בְּרִשְׁעִיָּא וּלְמַהֲוִיָּהוּן מִתְמַנִּין רַבִּין עֲלֵיהוֹן For the mighty God from on high watches the deeds of men whether good or evil, and from his presence are sent forth proud and strong men to rule over the wicked, and are appointed masters over them.

² Comp. Gesenius-Kautzsch²⁷, p. 405k.

עֲשִׂיהָ *her Maker*, Is. 22, 11; נוֹטִייהֶם *He who stretches them out*, Is. 42, 5; בּוֹרֵךְ *thy teacher*, Jer. 30, 20.

To these doubtful *intensive plurals* we may add בַּעֲלֶיךָ *thy husband*, Is. 54, 5, which, being used in parallelism with עֲשִׂיהָ, may be explained as formed on analogy; מִרְרִמִּי *him who lifteth it up*, Is. 10, 15, is interpreted by Delitzsch and others as a 'plural of majesty,' but it may also be explained as a plural denoting an indefinite individual;¹ cf. שְׁלֵחֵי Prov. 10, 26. For בּוֹרְאֵיךָ Ecc. 12, 1, which is usually explained as a 'plural of majesty,'² meaning the Creator, we should read, with Graetz,³ בּוֹרֵךְ or בְּאֵרֶךְ 'thy cistern,' which he interprets as a metaphorical expression for the wife of youth. In support of his explanation he brings the following parallel from Prov. 5, 15:

שִׁתָּה מֵיִם מִבּוֹרֶךְ וְנוֹזְלִים מִתְּוֶךְ בְּאֵרֶךְ

Drink water from thy own cistern,
running water from thy own well,

and this is explained by a gloss (v. 18) to mean:

יְהִי מִקְוֶהְךָ בְּרוּךְ וְשִׂמְחָה מֵאִשְׁתְּ נְעוּרֶיךָ

Let thy fountain be blessed,
and get joy from the wife of thy youth.

Compare Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Chicago, 1902), p. 47, n. 36.

Terms denoting appurtenances of God are very commonly employed in the plural with a singular signification. This is especially the case with terms designating the abode of God, *e. g.* in Ps. 68, 36 the pl. מִקְדָּשִׁים 'sanctuaries' is used in the sense of The Great Holy Sanctuary, *i. e.*, the Temple. In this passage we must read with the LXX בְּמִקְדָּשָׁיו for בְּמִקְדָּשֶׁיךָ.

נִרְאָא אֱלֹהִים בְּמִקְדָּשָׁיו אֱלֹהֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל הוּא
נִתְּחַדֵּז וְתַעֲצֻמּוֹת לְעַם בְּרוּךְ אֱלֹהִים:

Thou art terrible, O God in *Thy great holy sanctuary*,
thou art the God of Israel;
He that giveth strength and power to (His) people,
blessed be God.

¹ Comp. Gesenius-Kautzsch²⁷, p. 405, rem. 3.

² Comp. Wright, *Ecclesiastes in Relation to Modern Criticism and Pessimism* (London, 1888), p. 238; C. D. Ginsburg, *Kohleth* (London, 1861), pp. 456-475; Delitzsch, *Hoheleth und Kohleth* (Leipzig, 1875), p. 387, and others.

³ *Kohleth* (Leipzig, 1871), p. 133.

For the pl. **תַּעֲצֻמוֹת** compare below. For other examples of the pl. **מִקְדָּשִׁים** used in a singular sense compare Jer. 51, 51; Ps. 74, 17. For the plurals **עֲלִיּוֹת** and **מַעֲלֹת** employed as designations of the heavenly abode of God, see above, p. 201. Compare also **מִשְׁכָּנִים** Ps. 46, 5, **מִשְׁכְּנוֹת** Ps. 132, 5, and **נְאוֹת** Ps. 83, 13; these are *intensive plurals*, denoting 'majesty.'

In several passages the chariot of God is denoted by the pl. **מִרְכָּבוֹת** 'chariots,' *i. e.*, The Great Chariot.

Is. 66, 15.

פִּי־חֲנֹה^a בָּאשׁ יָבוֹא וּבִסְעָפָה מִרְכָּבוֹתָיו¹
לְהָשִׁיב בַּחֲמָה אָפוּ וּגְעִרְתּוֹ בִּלְהִבִּי אֵשׁ:

^a יְהוָה

For behold he will come in fire,
and in the whirlwind as His *chariot*;
To pay back in burning anger His wrath,
and His rebuke in flames of fire.

‡

Compare also Hab. 3, 8. In 2 Ki. 23, 11 the pl. **מִרְכָּבוֹת** designates the 'portable throne of the Sun-god'; *cf.* Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT), p. 295, l. 3. In Cant. 6, 12 Haupt translates **מִרְכָּבוֹת** by *the magnificent conveyance*; see his remarks *ad* Cant. 1, 9 (*AJSI*, 19, 15 = p. 68 of the reprint). Very frequently terms denoting inner states or qualities of God are employed in the plural, *e. g.*: **דְּעִים** Job 36, 4; 37, 16, or **דַּעֲוֹת** 1 Sam. 2, 3, lit. 'knowledges,' *i. e.*, *profound knowledge* or *divine knowledge*,² similarly the wrath of God is in Job 21, 30; 40, 11; Ps. 7, 7 **עֲבֵרוֹת** 'wraths,' *i. e.*, *most violent wrath*; His *terror* is in Ps. 88, 16; Job 20, 25 **אִיִּמִּים** 'terrors,' *i. e.*, *great terror*, or *divine terror*; a *divine vision* is denoted by the pl. **מִרְאֹת** (Gen. 46, 2; Ezek. 1, 1; 8, 3; 40, 2); His *strength* is **גְּבוּרוֹת** (Is. 63, 15), **תַּעֲצֻמוֹת** (Ps. 68, 36), or **אוֹנִים** (Is. 40, 26); His *deliverance* is **יִשְׁעוֹת** (Is. 26, 18; 33, 6, etc.) or **מוֹשָׁעוֹת** (Ps. 68, 21); His *vengeance* is **נִקְמוֹת** (Judg. 11, 36; 2 Sam. 4, 8).

The *intensive plural* **אלהים** is not only employed in reference to the God of Israel, but frequently also when heathen deities are spoken of, *e. g.*, 1 Ki. 11, 33 **לְעִשְׂתֹּתָת אֱלֹהֵי צִדְוֹן לְכַמּוֹשׁ אֱלֹהֵי**

¹ It is preferable to read **וּבִסְעָפָה** for **וּבִסְעָפָה** **מִרְכָּבוֹתָיו** is in apposition to **בִּסְעָפָה**; *cf.* Ps. 104, 2 and Dillmann, *Ethiop. Chrest.*, p. 15, l. 2 of the poem. It is not necessary, however, to read with the LXX, Cheyne, and others, **כָּאשׁ** for **בָּאשׁ**; for **כ=ב** see Haupt, *Canticles*, p. 55, *ad* 3, 6.

² See Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 19, *ad* 2, 3.

עֲמֹן מוֹאָב וּלְמִלְכָּם אֱלֹהֵי בְנֵי עֲמֹן to *Astoreth the divinity of the Sidonians, to Chemos, the god of Moab, and to Milcom, the god of the children of Ammon.*

While the pl. עֲשֶׁתֶּרֶת usually designates either the many images of Astarte, or the various goddesses of that name which were worshiped in different localities (*cf.* Judg. 10, 16; 1 Sam. 7, 4; 12, 10), there are two passages in which it appears to be employed as *pluralis intensivus*, equal to The Great Astarte, unless the Masoretic reading is incorrect. The reading is, however, supported by all the Ancient Versions.¹ Judg. 2, 13 וַיַּעֲזֹבוּ וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ אֶת־יְהוָה וַיַּעֲבֹדוּ לְבַעַל וְלַעֲשֶׁתֶּרֶת And they forsook JHVH and worshiped Ba'al and the Great Astarte. Professor Moore² is inclined, however, to adopt the reading of the singular. The second passage is 1 Sam. 31, 10a וַיִּשְׁכְּנוּ אֶת־פָּלִיו בֵּית עֲשֶׁתֶּרֶת And they put his armor in the house of the Great Astarte.

According to Keil³ בֵּית עֲשֶׁתֶּרֶת is here the plural of בֵּית עֲשֶׁתֶּרֶת on the analogy of בֵּית אֲבוֹת. This explanation is impossible inasmuch as only one temple can be referred to in this passage. Driver⁴ believes that the plural is here incorrectly used for the singular owing to the employment of the plural in other connections.

The plural תַּרְפִּים 'images,' 'household gods' is used in 1 Sam. 19, 13, 16 (and probably also in other passages; *cf.* Gen. 31, 34, 35, etc.) in a singular sense.⁵ The plural is of exactly the same nature as that in אֱלֹהִים.

Jer. 46, 14–19 is a prophecy of the successful invasion of Egypt by Nebuchadnezzar. The black bull Apis, to whom divine honors were paid in Memphis, is represented as having escaped from the city out of fear (v. 15), just as the idols of Egypt are said (Is. 19, 1) to have quaked at the approach of JHVH. Apis is in the passage ironically referred to by the pl. אַבְיִרִים 'bulls,' *i. e.*, The Mighty Bull. Giesbrecht, Duhm, and others adopt the reading of the singular, but this is quite unnecessary inasmuch

¹ Comp. Böttcher, *Lehrbuch der hebr. Spr.* (1866), Vol. I, p. 494.

² *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges* (in The International Critical Commentary series), New York, 1900, p. 70.

³ *Die Bücher Samuels*² (1875), ad 31, 10.

⁴ *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. 178, note ad 31, 10.

⁵ See Gesenius-Kautzsch²⁷, p. 404h; Nöldeke's review of Baethgen's *Beiträge zur semit. Religionsgeschichte* in ZDMG (1888), 42, pp. 476 ff.; on תַּרְפִּים in general, see Moore, *Judges*, note ad 17, 5.

as the plural may be best explained as *intensive*, of the same rank as the plurals אֱלֹהִים, תְּרָפִים, עֲשָׁרֹת, Assyr. *ilāni*, Ethiop. 'amlāk, and Phoen. אֱלִם. It is, therefore, construed with the sing. verb עָנַד, and referred to by the sing. suffix in הִדְפֹּא (v. 15). For נִסְחָהּ אֵל (in the same verse) it is best to read with the LXX (which has ἐφύγεν ὁ Ἄπις) נִסְ חָה,¹ חָה being equivalent to Egyptian Hapi 'Apis.' The pl. אֲבִירִים in the second hemistich is therefore parallel to חָה in the first hemistich, and the suffix in אֲבִירָהּ refers to Memphis. It will be sufficient for our purpose to quote only the first two couplets² (vv. 14-16). In v. 14 וְהַשְׁמִיעוּ and וּבַתְּהַפְנֹס are later scribal additions, and they are omitted by the LXX. Thus also סְבִיבֶיךָ at the end of the verse, כִּי יְהוָה הִדְפֹּא at the end of the next verse, and גַּם-נִפֹּל in v. 16 are to be regarded as glosses, inasmuch as they disturb the metre. For אֵל הֲרָבָה פִּשֵּׁל read with the LXX³ and Schwally⁴ וְרָבָה פֶּשֶׁל. The Hebrew text of the first two couplets should be arranged as follows:

וְהַשְׁמִיעוּ בָּךְ וְהָקֵן לָךְ :	46, 14 הַמִּגְדֹּל בְּמִגְדֹּל אֲמִרָהּ הַתִּנְצֹב
16c אֲבִירָהּ לֹא-עָמַד מִפְּנֵי-חֶרֶב הַיּוֹנָה :	15 מִדּוֹעֵ-נֶס חָה 16a וְרָבָה פֶּשֶׁל
46, 14 Tell it in Migdol Say: take a stand	proclaim it in Memphis; and prepare thyself.
15 Wherefore has Apis fled	thy mighty bull held not his ground;
16a Most of thy men have stum- bled,	16c before the oppressing sword.

Plurals like תְּרָפִים and אֲבִירִים are שְׁקוּצִים Dan. 9, 27 = The Great Abomination, and צִלָּמִים Am. 5, 26 = The Great Idol. The pl. שְׁקוּצִים is joined to a singular adjectival attribute (מְשֻׁמִּים 'desolating'). It probably refers to a heathen idol. Bevan (*The*

¹ See Duhm and Marti *ad locum*.

² The whole prophecy (vv. 14-19) consists of five couplets of double hemistichs, each hemistich having two beats.

³ The LXX has καὶ τὸ πλῆθος σου ἡσθένησε.

⁴ *Die Reden des Buches Jeremiah gegen die Heiden*, XXV, XLVI-LI, in ZATW, 1888, p. 193.

Book of Daniel, p. 160) reads שְׁקוּצִים מְשֻׁמִּים *there shall be abominations set up*. It is preferable, however, to explain the plural as intensive. The passage in which צִלְמִים is *pluralis intensivus* is rather obscure. It should probably be translated as follows: "And ye shall carry Sikkut your king, and Kaiwan *your great idol* (your solar deity) which you have made."¹

With צִלְמִים cf. Ethiop. amsäl.

D. Plural Expressions Denoting Royal Personages and Appurtenances of Royalty; also Plurals Denoting Lordship in General.

Terms in which the idea of royalty is inherent are frequently employed in the plural with a singular sense. The plural in such cases simply intensifies the idea of royalty inherent in the noun.

It is interesting to note that the Persian king, who is generally called in Greek *ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς*, is designated in a number of passages in the OT by the pl. מְלָכִים 'kings,' *i. e.*, The Great King,² and the Persian Empire by the pl. מַמְלָכוֹת 'kingdoms,' *i. e.*, The Great Kingdom. In a letter addressed by the Persian officials to Artaxerxes I. Longimanus, king of Persia (464–424 B. C.), preserved in Ezra 4, 11b–16, we read:

4, 12 יָדִיעַ לַהֲוֹא לְמִלְכָּא דִּי יְהוּדִיָּא דִּי סִלְקוּ מִן לְוִתָּה עֲלִינָא
אֲתוּ לִירוּשָׁלַם קְרִיתָא מְרֻדָּתָא וּבִאֲשֻׁתָּא בְנִין וְשׁוּרִיָּה³ יִשְׁכְּלֻלִין
וְאֲשִׁיָּה יְחִיטוּ⁴ 13 פֶּשַׁן יָדִיעַ לַהֲוֹא לְמִלְכָּא דִּי הֵן קְרִיתָא דָּה
תַּחְבִּנָּא וְשׁוּרִיָּה יִשְׁתַּכְּלֻלִין מִנְדָּא בְּלוּ וְהִלְךְ לָא יִתְנַנֵּן וְאַשְׁתָּם
מִלְכִּים תַּחְנִיק⁵ :

Let it be known to the king that the Jews who went up from thee unto us are come unto Jerusalem, rebuilding the rebellious and bad city; her walls they are completing, and her foundations they are removing.⁶ Be it known now to the king that if this city be rebuilt and her walls be completed, tax tribute and toll they will not give, and finally it (the city) will do harm to the Great King (מְלָכִים).

¹ The words סְכוּתָּה and כִּיּוֹן have been variously understood. The Ancient Versions render סְכוּתָּה *tabernacle*. According to Schrader (KAT², 442) סְכוּתָּה is to be pointed סְכוּתָּה, and כִּיּוֹן, כִּיּוֹן. He identifies them with two Babylonian-Assyrian deities, the first with Sakkut, and the latter with Kaiwān. His identification is almost certain, as these names appear together in a Babylonian religious text [IV R. 52, col. 4, l. 9; cf. Zimmern, *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Bab. Rel.*, 1896, p. 10, l. 179], where they are invoked together. Contrast KAT³, p. 476.

² Comp. Ethiop. 'amlāk; see Assy. pl. šarrāni, used in the sense of The Great King.

³ Read (with LXX) וְשׁוּרִיָּה and וְאֲשִׁיָּה for וְשׁוּרִיָּה and וְאֲשִׁיָּה.

⁴ Read, with Guthe, יִשְׁכְּלֻלִין for יִשְׁכְּלֻלִין.

⁵ מִלְכִּים instead of Aramaic מְלָכִים is a Hebraism.

⁶ For this rendering of יְחִיטוּ cf. Crit. Notes on Ezra-Nehemiah (SBOT), p. 62, l. 35.

The context shows that the pl. מַלְכִּים (v. 13) means The Great King (ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς). This is especially evident from the following verse (v. 14): "Now because we eat the salt of the palace, and it is not proper for us to see the dishonor of the king, we send and make known unto the king." Moreover, if we consider מַלְכִּים a numerical plural, it would not suit the context. The Persian officials wished to inform the king of Persia that if he should permit the Jews to rebuild the rebellious city and its walls, there would be immediate danger of their rebelling against him, and not that it would do harm to kings in general. Taken in connection with the other passages in which the plural is employed to designate the Persian king there remains very little doubt that our explanation is correct. In v. 15, however, the pl. מַלְכֵי is numerical; but, again, in v. 22 it may be *intensive*.

According to Haupt¹ the plural מַלְכִּים Ps. 110, 5 is *intensive*, equal to The Great King (of Persia). He refers the psalm to Zerubbabel,² a prince of the Davidic family who was governor of Judea during the reign of Hystaspes (521-485 B. C.). The presence of a scion of the house of David in Judea stimulated projects for the restoration of the Davidic dynasty. The two prophets of that time, Haggai and Zechariah, prophesied a grand future. The great Persian Empire would be annihilated, and Zerubbabel would restore the political independence of the Jews, and become their Messianic King. We read (Zech. 6, 9) that the prophet Zechariah is commanded to make a magnificent crown and set it upon the head of Zerubbabel.³ He was to be at the same time king and priest at the right hand of יהוה. It was in this age that Ps. 110, referring to Zerubbabel, was written. To show the *intensive use* of the plural מַלְכִּים when employed as a designation of the king of Persia vv. 5, 6 may be cited, as restored by Haupt in connection with his interpretation of Messianic Psalms in the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University, during the session 1902-3.

¹ Comp. Johns Hopkins University Circulars, No. 114 (July, 1904), p. 110.

² On Zerubbabel see Notes on Isaiah (Eng. transl.), p. 199, ll. 17 ff.; Crit. Notes on Ezra-Nehemiah (SBOT), I, 9, v. 24. E. Sellin in his *Serubbabel* (1898) advanced the view that all 'Ebed-יהוה' songs refer to Zerubbabel. He has since retracted this theory in his *Studien zur Entstehungsgesch. der jüd. Gemeinde nach dem bab. Exil* (1901), Vol. II, pp. 163-199. Cf. also Haupt, Is. 40, in Drugulin's *Marksteine*.

³ In the received text the name of Zerubbabel is omitted, and the name of Joshua ben Jehozedek is mentioned; there is reason to believe, however, that in the original text there was only the name of Zerubbabel. See discussion on this passage, below, pp. 225.

אֲדָלִי יָדָיו בְּגוֹיִם מַחֲץ מַלְכִּים :
 מִחֲרָשׁ עַל-אֶרֶץ רַבָּה מִלֵּא גּוֹיֹת :

My lord (Zerubbabel) will punish the heathen,
 and will shatter the Great King (of Persia)
 He will shatter the head over a wide land,
 he will fill it with dead corpses.

Duhm (*Die Psalmen*, p. 254) and others refer the psalm to Simon, the Maccabee. This view, as well as the theory that it refers to the Maccabean conqueror, John Hyrcanus (135–105 B. C.), son of Simon, is untenable, as already pointed out by Haupt. It is held by some that the psalm is an acrostic of the name of Simon.¹ The objection against this view is that שִׁב (v. 1), the first letter of which is supposed to furnish the first consonant of שִׁבְעָה begins the second hemistich, and not the first. Moreover, we should expect the whole poem to be acrostic.²

With regard to metre the psalm must be divided into two stanzas, each stanza consisting of five mēshālīm or poetic lines. Each māshāl has two hemistichs, three beats in the first, and two in the second.

In Ps. 45 (in which, according to Haupt, is celebrated the wedding of King Alexander Balas of Syria with Cleopatra, the daughter of King Ptolomy VI., Philometer of Egypt, which took place at Ptolomais, in 150 B. C.³) v. 10 בְּנוֹת מַלְכִּים and בִּיקְרוֹתֶיהָ are explained by Haupt as *intensive plurals*.

בְּנוֹת מַלְכִּים בִּיקְרוֹתֶיהָ נִצְבָּה שָׁגֵל לְיָמִינָהּ :

But *thy brightest jewel* is the noble daughter (*i. e.*, Cleopatra) of the great king (*i. e.*, Ptolomy VI),
 Who is to stand as consort at thy right hand.

In the same way Haupt explains the pl. בְּחָלוֹת (v. 15) as *intensive*, equal to The Noble Virgin. לְרַקְבֹת which is at the beginning of v. 15 he inserts before מִמְשַׁבְּצוֹת v. 14. For מִבְּאֵר לָהּ v. 15 he reads מִבְּאֵר לָהּ. פְּתִיחָהּ and פְּלִי-בְּהִידָהּ v. 14, and אֶחָרֶיהָ v. 15 he regards as glosses. לְבוּשָׁהּ v. 14 he inserts after בְּחֵלֶהּ (*ibid.*). The Hebrew text of vv. 14. 15 as restored by Haupt reads, therefore, as follows:

¹ Discovered by Bickell, and accepted by Duhm (*Die Psalmen*, p. 255).

² König, *Einl.*, p. 404, Anm.

³ Cf. Haupt, *Book of Canticles*, p. 22, note 7 = *AJSL*, 18, 212, and his article on "The Poetic Form of the First Psalm" in *AJSL* (April, 1903), p. 135.

בַּת־מֶלֶךְ לְבוּשָׁה לְרֻקְמָנוֹת מִמִּשְׁבָּצוֹת זָהָב;
תֹּובֵל לְמֶלֶךְ בַּתְּלוֹת רֵעוֹתֶיהָ מִבְּאוֹת לָהּ;

The king's daughter clad in brocade
embroidered with gold.
The *noble virgin* is brought to the king,
her companions conduct her.¹

We shall now discuss the several plurals employed to designate the Persian Empire.

Haggai, announcing the approaching overthrow of the Persian Empire, says:

2, 22.²

אֲנִי־מִרְעִישׁ אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְהִפַּכְתִּי כִסֵּא מִמְּלָכוֹת
וְהִפַּכְתִּי מִרְפָּעָה וְרוֹכְבֶיהָ אִישׁ־בְּחֶרֶב אֶחָיו וְפָלוּ;

And I will shake the heavens and the earth,
and I will overthrow the throne of *the Great Kingdom*;
And I will overthrow the chariots and those that ride in them,
every one by the sword of his brother shall fall.

The pl. מִמְּלָכוֹת in this passage is *intensive*, being equivalent to The Great Empire (of Persia). It was thus understood also by Rashi who in his note on מִמְּלָכוֹת remarked: מַלְכוּת פֶּרַס שֶׁהוּא מוֹשֵׁלֶת: *it refers to the Persian Empire which was then ruling the whole world.*

In several passages in the Book of Daniel מֶלֶךְ 'king' is employed in the sense of מִמְּלָכָה 'kingdom,' *e. g.*, the Four Empires are called (7, 17) אַרְבַּעָה מַלְכִּין *the four kings*. In two passages (8, 20; 10, 13) the pl. מַלְכִּים is *intensive*, equal to מִמְּלָכוֹת Hag. 2, 22, *i. e.*, The Great Empire (of Persia).

DAN. 8, 20.

הָאֵיל אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתָ בְּעַל הַקִּרְנִים מַלְכֵי מִדִּי וּפָרַס;

The ram which thou hast seen with two horns is the Great Empire of Media and Persia.

¹ For a discussion on the text and metre of the whole psalm *cf.* his article on "The Poetic Form of the First Psalm" in *AJSL* (April, 1903), p. 135.

² The last clause of 2, 21 belongs to the following verse. The clause וְיִרְדּוּ סוֹסִים וְרוֹכְבֵיהֶם may be an illustrative quotation based on Ex. 15, 5. At the end of the clause וְיִרְדּוּ סוֹסִים we must supply וְרוֹכְבֵיהֶם. Grätz's conjecture וְיִרְדּוּ for וְיִרְדּוּ is not good. *Cf.* Haupt's paper *Erläuternde Citate in Allen Testament* in the Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Congress of Orientalists, held at Hamburg, Sept. 1902.

That the author conceived the Medo-Persian Empire as a unity is evident from the fact that he employs one symbol to represent it, the original separateness of Media and Persia being indicated by the two horns. The pl. מַלְכֵי must therefore be explained as *intensive*, equal to The Great Empire, and cannot be numerical, as all exegetes understand it. Our interpretation is further supported by the LXX which renders מַלְכֵי מִדֵּי וּפָרַס by βασιλεὺς Μήδων καὶ Περσῶν, *i. e.*, מֶלֶךְ מִדֵּי וּפָרַס.

In Dan. 10, 13 (at the end of the verse) we must insert שָׂר before מַלְכֵי, on the basis of the LXX.¹ שָׂר מַלְכֵי פָרַס is here equal to שָׂר מַלְכוּת פָּרַס at the beginning of the verse. It is quite unnecessary to read (with the LXX, Theodotion, Marti) הוֹתִירָתִי for הוֹתִירָתִי. The verse may be rendered as follows:

But the prince of the kingdom of Persia (*i. e.*, the guardian angel of the Persian Empire) stood up against me for twenty-one days, but, lo! Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me while I had been left alone there contending with the prince of the *Empire* of Persia.

Bevan² interprets the phrase מַלְכֵי פָרַס to be 'an intentionally vague phrase for the "Persian Dynasty."' This interpretation is rather vague, and it is preferable to consider מַלְכֵי a *pluralis intensivus* = The Great Kingdom.

In Prov. 16, 12, 13 מֶלֶךְִים means the Great King, *i. e.*, the Ideal King.³

PROV. 16, 12-13.

תוֹעֵבָה מֶלֶכִּים עֲשׂוֹת־רָשָׁע פִּי־בִצְדָקָה יִפּוֹן כֶּסֶף :
רָצוֹן מֶלֶכִּים שְׂפִת־יָדָק וְדָבַר יִשְׁרָיִם יֶאֱהָב :

It is abomination to the Great King to commit wickedness,
for the throne is established by righteousness.
A delight of the Great King are righteous lips,
and him who speaks right he loveth.

Müller and Kautzch (in SBOT) read the sing. מֶלֶךְ in v. 13 on the authority of the LXX which has the singular even in

¹ The LXX renders the last clause of the verse by μετὰ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως τῶν Περσῶν, *i. e.*, אֶצְל שָׂר מֶלֶךְ פָּרַס. The reading of the LXX is preferred by Behrman, Berthold, and Marti.

² *The Book of Daniel* (Cambridge, 1896), p. 168.

³ Comp. Haupt's remark in Crit. Notes on Prov. (SBOT), p. 49, l. 3.

v. 12. The reading of the LXX, however, only supports our view that the pl. מְלָכִים is *intensive*. Toy¹ reads (v. 13) יִאָּהֲבֵי for יִאָּהֲבֵי.

We shall now discuss several (royal) *intensive plurals* employed in the Ode of Triumph on the last Babylonian Monarch (Nabonidus), contained in Isa. 14, 4b-21.

Isa. 14, 4b-21 is generally interpreted to be an ode of triumph on the downfall of the last Babylonian King Nabonidus (555-539 B. C.).² It was thus also understood by the editor who prefixed vv. 1-4a, and added vv. 22 ff. The ode cannot be the genuine work of Isaiah as it presupposes a situation entirely different from that of the time of the prophet.³ It must have been composed by a poet who lived toward the close of the exile.⁴ Though he employs the perfect tense the ode is really a prophecy. It may be divided into five stanzas, each containing seven double-hemistichs, the first hemistich having three beats, and the second two.⁵

In v. 5 it is not necessary to read, with Guthe, the sing. מוֹשֶׁל for מְשָׁלִים, as both מְשָׁלִים and רְשָׁעִים may be explained as *intensive plurals*. These plurals, if regarded as numerical, are quite unintelligible here, inasmuch as the context shows that the poet is speaking of one special king, *i. e.*, Nabonidus. To show the *intensive use* of the plurals מְשָׁלִים and רְשָׁעִים it will be necessary to give here the Hebrew text and translation of the first stanza of the ode. For מְדַהֲבָה (v. 4) read with the LXX מְדַהֲבָה;⁶ for שָׁבֵר we should probably read הַשָּׁבֵר, ה omitted on account of the preceding ה (haplography), or שָׁבֵר, and cancel יִהְיֶה; for הַשָּׁדִי it is better to read the inf. הַשָּׁדִי.

¹ Proverbs, p. 326, note on v. 13.

² Cf. Driver, *Introduction*³, p. 212; Marti, *Das Buch Jesaya*, p. 128; Duhm, etc., Strachey (*Hebrew Politics in the Times of Sargon and Sennacherib*, pp. 148 ff.), and Cobb (*JBL*, 1896, p. 31) think that מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל v. 4 is employed as a title of the king of Assyria. Cobb (*JBL*, 1896, p. 28) refers the ode to Sennacherib; Winckler originally interpreted it of Sennacherib (*Altor. Forsch.*, 193 ff.), but explains it now of the murder of Sargon (*ibid.*, 414).

³ Comp. Cheyne, *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (1895), p. 67; Driver, *Introduction*³, p. 212.

⁴ Driver, *ibid.*

⁵ Comp. Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT), p. 278; for Eduard Siever's metrical arrangement of the whole poem, cf. his *Metrische Studien* (Leipzig, 1901), p. 438. His metrical arrangement is not very good. He neither divides the poem into sections, nor does he eliminate from it later scribal additions. He makes several serious mistakes in vocalization and accentuation of a number of words, *e. g.*, he reads (v. 9) בּוֹאֵץ for בּוֹאֵץ, לָךְ for לָךְ, etc. Comp. also Marti, Duhm, and Cheyne.

⁶ So nearly all exegetes since J. D. Michaelis.

Omit also מִפֶּת and מִרְדֶּה v. 6. For the sake of the metre we must transpose the words of 8b so as to read לֹא־יַעֲלֶה הַכֶּרֶת¹ : מֵאֵז שָׁכַבְתָּ : עָלֵינוּ | מֵאֵז שָׁכַבְתָּ : The first section of the poem should be arranged as follows:

שבתה מרהבה :	אֵיךְ שֶׁכַּת נָגַשׁ	14, 4b
שבט משלים :	הַשֹּׁבֵר מִטָּה רָשָׁעִים	5
בלתי סרה	מִכָּה עַמִּים בַּעֲבָרָה	6
בלי חֶשֶׁד :	רָדָה בְּאֵז גּוֹיִם	
פצחו רִנָּה :	נָחָה שִׁקְטָה כְּלִי־הָאָרֶץ	7
ארץ לבנון	גַּם־בְּרוּשִׁים שִׁמְחוּ לָךְ	8
מֵאֵז שָׁכַבְתָּ :	לֹא־יַעֲלֶה הַכֶּרֶת עָלֵינוּ	

How still has the despot become,

how still the raging !

JHVH hath broken the staff of the Great Wicked One,

the rod of the Great Tyrant,

Who smote peoples in passion,

with no cessation,

Who trampled the nations in anger,

with no restraint !

Still and at rest is the whole earth,

into joyful cry they break out,

Also the cypress-trees rejoice at thy fate,

and the cedars of Lebanon:

There cometh up no woodman against us,

since thou art laid low.

מִכָּה and רָדָה may both be referred to מִטָּה (*cf.* Ps. 2, 19; 110, 2);² it is better, however, to refer them to רָשָׁעִים and מְשָׁלִים. *Cf.* אֲדָנִים קָשָׁה Is. 19, 4.

Similarly we must explain the pl. מְרַעִים (v. 20) as meaning The Great Evil Doer, and אֲבוֹתָם (v. 21) as meaning Their Great Father. In both cases our interpretation is supported by the LXX, which renders them as singulars. Marti and Cheyne read the singular, but this is unnecessary. In v. 20 עֲמָךְ הָרִגְתָּ is a later scribal expansion, as is shown by the metre. For וּמִלֹּאֵז we should probably read וּמִלֹּאֵז עִיִּים.

¹ Comp. Crit. Notes on Kings (SBOT), p. 280, l. 37.

² So Marti, Duhm, Cheyne, etc.

14, 20 לֹא־תִחַד אַתָּם בַּקְבוּרָה כִּי־אַרְצָךְ שָׁחַת
 לֹא יִקְרָא לְעוֹלָם זֶרַע מִרְעִים:
 הָכִינוּ לְבִנְיָו מִטְבַּח בְּעֵץ אֲבוֹתָם
 בִּלְיִקְוָמוֹ וִירְשׁוּ אֶרֶץ וּמִלְאוּהָ עֵיִם:

Thou mayest not be joined with them in burial,
 for thy land thou hast destroyed;
 Never may be named
 the seed of the Great Evil Doer!
 Prepare shambles for his sons
 for the sin of their Great Father,
 That they may not rise up and take possession of the earth,
 and fill it with ruins.

In Is. 3, 12 נִגְשִׁים is *pluralis intensivus* for נִגְשָׁה 'ruler.'¹

עַמִּי נִגְשָׁיו מֵעוֹלָל וְנָשִׁים מִשְׁלֹו בּו
 עַמִּי מֵאַשְׁרֵיךְ מִתְעִים וְדֶרֶךְ אֲרֻחֲתֶיךָ בִלְעָו:

My people—a child is their ruler,
 and women rule over him;
 My people—thy guides lead thee astray,
 and thy paths they have corrupted.

Cf. נִגְשִׁיךְ Is. 60, 17.

Ezek. 19, 1 נְשִׂאִים is *pluralis intensivus* for נְשִׂיא:²

וַאֲפָה שָׂא קִנְיָה אֶל־נְשִׂאֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל:

And do thou lift up a lamentation on the Great Prince of Israel.

This verse is a superscription of a lamentation (vv. 2–9) addressed to Zedekiah, and the pl. נְשִׂאֵי can refer only to this prince. Ewald and Cornill adopt the reading of the singular on the basis of the LXX; but this is unnecessary.

The pl. נִשְׂוֹת 'branches' Ezek. 19, 11 is *intensive*, meaning The Noblest Branch, *i. e.*, the Davidic family, and the pl. שִׁבְטֵי 'scepters' is equivalent to The Great Scepter.

Ezek. 19, 10–14 is a lamentation on Judah and her unfortunate king Zedekiah. Judah is likened unto a fruitful vine, planted by waters. Its *noblest branch* (נִשְׂוֹת) became a *great royal scepter* (שִׁבְטֵי מְשֻׁלִּים). It towered high above the other branches, but

¹ Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch²⁷, p. 405, k.

² See Crit. Notes on Ezekiel (SBOT) p. 70, l. 48.

in wrath the vine was plucked up, its mighty branch was broken off, and it withered. The vine was then planted in a desert land (*i. e.*, in exile). A fire went forth from the branch (*i. e.*, from Zedekiah who was a member of the Davidic family), and consumed all its boughs.

That the pl. **בִּטּוֹחַ** is *intensive* is shown by the fact that it is referred to in the same verse by singular suffixes (**בִּגְבוּהוּ**, **קוֹמֵתּוֹ**, **דְּלִיּוֹתָיו**). Modern critics (Cornill, Bertholet, etc.) are inclined to adopt the reading of the singular.

After making the proper textual emendations and eliminating the glosses, the poem divides itself into five couplets of double-hemistichs, with two beats in each hemistich. In v. 12b we must read **וְהַתְּפִיקוּ וַיִּבְשׁוּ** for **וְהַתְּפִיקוּ וַיִּבְשׁוּ**, inasmuch as the subject of these two verbs is the sing. **בִּטּוֹחַ**; the final **ו** of **וְהַתְּפִיקוּ** may be explained as dittography of the initial **ו** of **וַיִּבְשׁוּ**.¹ **בְּדַמְּךָ** 'in thy blood' (v. 10) is unintelligible, and overburdens the first hemistich; it must, therefore, be omitted.² **עַז** (v. 11) has crept in from v. 14, and **וְהַתְּגַבּוּהוּ קוֹמֵתּוֹ עַל־בֵּן עֲבָתִים** (*ibid.*) is a gloss to **וַיִּרְא בִּגְבוּהוּ בֵּרֶב דְּלִיּוֹתָיו**. In v. 12 **אֲשֶׁר אָכַלְתָּהּ** is a variant to the first clause of v. 14. In v. 13 **בְּמִדְבָּר** and either **צִיָּה** or **צִמָּא** are glosses.³ In v. 14 **פְּרִיָּה** is evidently dittography of **בְּרִיָּה**,⁴ and **שֶׁבֶט לְמִשּׁוֹל** is a gloss to **עַז**; also **מִבִּטּוֹחַ** (*ibid.*) is to be regarded as a gloss. The last clause of v. 12 should be preceded by v. 13. The Hebrew text should be arranged as follows:

עַל־מִיָּם שְׁתוּלָה	אֶמֶךָ כִּנְפֶךָ	19, 10
מִמִּיָּם רִבִּים :	פְּרִיָּה וְעִנְפָּה	
אֶל־שִׁבְטֵי מִשְׁלָם	וַיִּקְרֹלָה מִשּׁוֹת	11
בִּרְבַּב דְּלִיּוֹתָיו :	וַיִּרְא בִּגְבוּהוּ	
לְאַרְץ הַשְּׁלֶכֶה	וְתַתַּשׁ בַּחֲמָה	12a
הַיּוֹבֵשׁ פְּרִיָּה	וְרוּחַ הַקָּדִים	

¹ So Cornill, *Prophet Ezekiel*, p. 291.

² So Cornill; on the authority of the LXX (*ἀνθος ἐν ῥοῇ*) Aug. Calmel and Gesenius read **בְּדַמְּךָ**. Toy reads simply **בְּכֶרֶם**. Cornill rightly strikes out this word.

³ The LXX translates only one of these two words.

⁴ So Cornill.

בְּאֶרֶץ צִמָּא	וַעֲתָה שְׂתוּלָה	13
מִטָּה עֲזָה:	הַתִּפְרָק וַיִּבֶשׁ	12b

בְּדִיה אֵקְלָה	וַתֵּצֵא אֵשׁ	14
מִטָּה קִז:	וְלֹא הִזְדִּיבָהּ	

This may be translated into English as follows:

19, 10	Thy mother was like a vine Fruitful and full of branches	by waters planted, from plentiful waters.
11	Her noblest branch Lofty it towered	became a <i>great royal sceptre</i> ; with the mass of its boughs.
12a	But in wrath it was plucked up And the east wind	to the ground cast down, withered its fruits.
13	Now it is planted	in a thirsty land
12b	Broken and withered	is its mighty branch.
14	A fire has gone forth And she has no more	its boughs it consumed; a mighty branch.

One of the examples of the *pluralis intensivus* is עֲטָרוֹת Zech. 6, 10, 14 which means *a most magnificent crown*. It has always been a matter of dispute as to whether one or two crowns are spoken of in the passage (Zech. 6, 9–13). The view of Wellhausen¹ is not conclusive. He believes that the singular verb תהיה v. 14 proves beyond any doubt that only one crown was intended, and he, accordingly, adopts the reading of the sing. עֲטָרָה. It is a well known fact, however, that the so-called *pluralis inhumanus* is frequently construed with a singular verb,² and this is the regular construction in Arabic. Hitzig thinks that two crowns were signified, one made of gold, and the other of silver. The question cannot be decided, however, from the plural form of עֲטָרוֹת, nor from the singular verb תהיה (v. 14), but only by a critical study of the whole passage.

A careful examination will convince any unprejudiced reader that the original form of the prophecy has been tampered with.

¹ Cf. *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, part 5 (Berlin, 1892), pp. 48, 178.

² See Gesenius-Kautzsch²⁷, p. 472k; Ewald § 317a.

From v. 11 it would appear that Joshua, the high priest, was to assume both the insignia of royalty and the priestly dignity, whereas the concluding words of v. 13 'and there shall be a priest upon his throne' (or better read with the LXX 'at his right hand'), 'and a counsel of peace shall be between them both' would seem to indicate that at some previous time the names of both Zerubbabel and Joshua were mentioned in the prophecy, the former to be crowned as head of the temporal power, and the latter as head of the spiritual power. Moreover, the term 'sprout' (צִמְחָה v. 12) is a title distinctly given (*cf.* Jer. 23, 5; 33, 15) to the Messiah who was to be a scion of the house of David. Now, this title applies very well to Zerubbabel but not to Joshua. Ewald suggested that we should read in v. 11 'upon the head of Zerubbabel and upon the head of Joshua.' A more critical examination of the passage shows, however, very clearly that in the original form of the prophecy only the name of Zerubbabel was mentioned. According to Haupt¹ the text of the passage passed through three stages. Originally only the name of Zerubbabel was in the text. Then the name of Joshua was inserted, and while both names were in the text a gloss was added at the end of v. 13 'and a counsel of peace shall be between them both.' Later the name of Zerubbabel was omitted out of fear of interference on the part of the Persian government. For as long as the Jews remained a religious sect the Persian government would not interfere, but as soon as they showed national aspirations by crowning a scion of the royal family, they would immediately be accused of plotting defection from Persia. The enemies of the Jews, especially the Samaritans, would have been but too glad to get hold of Zechariah's prophecy in its original form, for the purpose of drawing the attention of the Persian ruler to the disloyalty of the Jews. It is, therefore, very easy to see why the name of Zerubbabel was omitted. The name of the high priest was retained as the crowning of the spiritual head was not likely to arouse any suspicion. Verse 14 was further added as a political gloss in order to show that the crown was intended exclusively for religious purposes. For similar reasons they have altered the names of the four Babylonian Jews who brought gold and silver for the making of the crown.² But if originally only the

¹ He interpreted this passage in the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University, in the session 1903-1904.

² *Cf.* vv. 10 and 14.

name of Zerubbabel was in the text, the pl. עֲטֹרוֹת must be explained as *intensive*, equal to a *most magnificent crown*. We find a support for our interpretation in the Chaldee paraphrase which renders the plural by כְּלִיל רַב 'a great crown.'

For יהוה כהן לימיני על כסאו (v. 13) Haupt reads יהוה כהן לימיני *and he* (Zerubbabel) *shall be priest at my right hand, i. e., of God.*¹ Zerubbabel was to assume according to Zechariah (as also according to the author of Ps. 110) not only the insignia of royalty, but also to be priest at the right hand of God. Haupt also omits the last clause of v. 12 וּבְנָה אֶת הַכֵּל יְהוָה (omitted in the Syriac version), and he regards the beginning of the next verse והוא יבנה את הַכֵּל יְהוָה as a variant to this clause.

The pl. עֲטֹרוֹת is also *intensive* in Job 31, 36b:

אֶעֱדָנִי עֲטֹרוֹת לִי

I would adorn myself with it as if it were a *magnificent crown*.

Like עֲטֹרוֹת Zech. 6, 10, 14; Job 31, 36, the greatest Jewish poet of the Middle Ages, Rabbi Yehuda Halevi (1086–1142), employs נִזָּרִים (plural of נִזָּר 'crown') as *pluralis intensivus*, in his famous Ode to Zion.

יִשְׁנֶה וְהִחְלוֹה כְּלִיל כָּל־מַמְלָכוֹת הָאֱלִיל
חֲסָדָךְ לְעוֹלָם לְדוֹר וָדוֹר נִזָּרֶיךָ;

It will change and pass away the crown of the kingdom of the heathen,
But thy power is eternal, for all generations is *thy magnificent crown*.

Dan. 7, 9 פְּרִסְתֵּן "thrones" = a *magnificent throne*.

Dan. 7, 9–14 pictures a celestial assize held for the purpose of executing judgment upon the Gentile power. The Almighty, who appears in the likeness of an aged man with hair like spotless wool, and snow-white raiment, takes his seat upon a Magnificent Throne (כִּרְסֵן) of fire, and is surrounded by His myriads of celestial attendants. The word for throne in v. 9 is in the plural in order to designate a *magnificent throne*.

The plurals אֲדָרִים 'lords' and בָּעָלִים 'masters' are frequently employed in a singular sense, but these two *intensive plurals* are too well known to require any discussion.²

¹ The LXX reads כהן לימיני יהוה; cf. Ps. 110, which Haupt refers to Zerubbabel; in *Johns Hopkins University Circulars*, No. 114 (June, 1894) p. 110.

² Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch²⁷, p. 405, i.

In Ps. 105, 6 the pl. בְּחֵירִים 'chosen ones' is employed to designate Jacob.

זֶרַע אַבְרָהָם עַבְדּוֹ בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב בְּחֵירָיו :

Ye seed of Abraham His servant,
Ye sons of Jacob His Chosen One.

Hupfeld, Wellhausen, and Duhm, following Dyserink, read the sing. בְּחִירוֹ ; Baethgen reads with the LXX the pl. עַבְדּוֹ in the first hemistich, and refers בְּחֵירָיו and עַבְדּוֹ not to אַבְרָהָם and יַעֲקֹב but to זֶרַע and בְּנֵי. It is better, however, to retain the ~~א~~ reading, and to take the pl. בְּחִירִים as *intensive*.

With the above passage compare Ps. 114, 2:

הִיְתָה יְהוּדָה לְקֹדֶשׁ יִשְׂרָאֵל מִמְשֻׁלֹתָיו :

Judah became his sanctuary,
Israel—His Great Dominion.

Ps. 105, 15 מְשִׁיחִי My Anointed and נְבִיאִי My Prophet. Wellhausen¹ correctly observes that the terms *the chosen, the anointed, the prophet*, as employed in this passage, can be used only in the singular. 'There is only one Prophet or Messiah at one time (e. g., Abraham, Isaac, Jacob), and God can speak only concerning this one.' Wellhausen points, therefore, בְּמִשְׁיחִי וְלִנְבִיאִי. This emendation is, however, quite unnecessary, for like בְּחֵירָיו (v. 6) these plurals may be explained as *intensive*.

In quite a number of passages in the Old Testament the royal city of Judah (*i. e.*, Jerusalem) is denoted by the plural עָרִים cities, *i. e.*, the city *par excellence*.²

Is. 40, 9.

עֲלֵיהֶר גְּבֵהַ עֲלֵי־לָךְ מִבְּשָׂרַת צִיּוֹן
הָרִימִי בְּקֶח קוֹלְךָ מִבְּשָׂרַת יְרוּשָׁלַם³
אֲמַרְי לְעָרֵי יְהוּדָה הִנֵּה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם :

Get thee up on a high mountain,
O thou that bringest good tidings to Zion!
Lift up mightily thy voice,
O thou that bringest good tidings to Jerusalem!
Say to the Capital of Judah,
Here is your God.

¹ Cf. Notes on Psalms (SBOT), p. 104, l. 14; Crit. Notes on Psalms (SBOT), p. 93, l. 10.

² See Haupt in Drugulin's *Marksteine*.

³ הָרִימִי אֶל תִּירָאִי is a later scribal expansion, as is shown by the metre.

Cf. Is. 64, 9; Lam. 5, 11, etc.

In Cant. 1, 17 the abode of the bride and bridegroom (who are termed King and Queen) is denoted by the pl. בָּתִּים = The Magnificent Abode.¹ In the El-Amarna Letters the pl. bitāti is also frequently employed in a singular sense. *Cf.*, for instance, Winckler, *The Tell El-Amarna Letters*, No. 19 (B.²¹) l. 9, and No. 25 (L.⁵) ll. 2 and 6.

In conclusion may be mentioned a few plural nouns denoting appurtenances of great personages: בִּשְׂכָבִים *bed*, Gen. 49, 4; יְצוּעִים *bed*, Ps. 63, 7; Job 17, 13.

E. Intensive Plurals of Abstract Nouns.

A great many abstract nouns in Hebrew that are commonly employed in the singular are sometimes used in the plural for the purpose of intensifying the idea inherent in the stem. These plurals may very frequently express the idea of 'fullness' or 'excellence.' The following are the clearest examples of *intensive plurals* of abstract nouns in the Old Testament:

שִׂמְחָה² Ps. 45, 16, *great gladness*, and Ps. 16, 11, *supreme gladness*; בְּרָכָה Ps. 21, 7, *abundant blessing*; הִקְמָה³ Ps. 49, 4; Prov. 24, 7, *profound wisdom*; בִּינָה Is. 27, 11, and תְּבוּנוֹת Is. 40, 14; Ps. 49, 4; 78, 72; Prov. 11, 12; 28, 16, *keen understanding*; בִּשְׂתָּה Job 12, 6, and מְבַשְּׂתִים Is. 32, 18, *full confidence*; גְּבוּרָה Job 41, 4, *extraordinary strength*, and Is. 63, 15, *of the strength of God*; יְדוֹת 1 Sam. 2, 3, and יְדֵים Job 36, 4; 37, 16, *thorough or profound knowledge*; אֲמִינוֹת Prov. 28, 30, and אֲמִנוֹת Prov. 20, 6, *perfect faithfulness*; אוֹמֵר Is. 40, 26, *omnipotence*; חֲמָה Ps. 76, 11; Prov. 22, 24, *fierce wrath*; מִשְׁכָּרִיָּה Prov. 24, 34, *thy utter want or destitution*; מִשְׁפָּתָה Lam. 1, 7, *her utter destruction*; נִקְמָה Judg. 11, 36; 2 Sam. 4, 8, *great vengeance*; נְדָבָה Ps. 110, 3, *all willingness*; הוֹדָה Ps. 5, 10; 38, 13; 52, 4; 55, 12; 57, 2; 91, 3; 94, 20; Prov. 17, 4; 19, 13; Job 6, 9, *utter destruction*; תְּהוֹמָה Job 21, 2, and תְּהוֹמוֹת Ps. 94, 19, *an abundance of consolation*; עֲבָרָה

¹ *Cf.* Haupt, *The Book of Canticles* (Reprinted from THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE, Vol. XVIII, pp. 193-245; Vol. XIX, pp. 1-3 (July and October, 1902), p. 64, note on 1, 17).

² *Cf.* Solomon Glassius, *Philologia Sacra* (1705), col. 618: שִׂמְחָה (Ps. 45, 16) *laetitiae*, h. e. *summa laetitia*.

³ *Cf.* Crit. Notes on Proverbs (SBOT) p. 59, l. 45.

Job 40, 11, 21, 30; Ps. 7, 7, *violent wrath* or *great flood of wrath*; חֲנוּמֹה Job 33, 15, *deep slumber* (cf. Prov. 24, 23); בּוֹשָׁרוֹת Ps. 68, 7, *complete happiness* or *prosperity*; אֲשֶׁרִי Ps. 1, 1, etc., *the happiness of*; חֲרָפוֹת Dan. 12, 2, *utter contempt*; מוֹשָׁעוֹת Ps. 68, 21, and יִשׁוּעוֹת Is. 26, 18; 33, 6; Ps. 18, 51; 28, 8; 42, 6, 12; 43, 5; 53, 7; 74, 12; 116, 13, *complete salvation*; הַשְּׁכִים and מְהַשְּׁכִים *thick darkness*; מְנוּחֹת Ps. 23, 2, *perfect quietude*; חֲמִידוֹת Dan. 9, 23; 11, 19, *greatly beloved*; אִימִים Ps. 88, 16; Job 20, 25, *great terror*; cf. חֲרָדוֹת Ezek. 26, 16; בְּהִלּוֹת Jer. 15, 8; and בְּלִהוֹת Ezek. 26, 16; 27, 36; Ps. 73, 19; צִהְצְהוֹת Is. 58, 11, *complete aridity*; מִרְאֹת Gen. 46, 2; Ezek. 43, 3 *a great or important vision*; מִסְתָּרִים Ps. 10, 8; 17, 12; Lam. 3, 10a, *close hiding place*; הַבָּלִים¹ Ecc. 5, 6, *utter vanity*; מְמוֹתִים Jer. 16, 4; Ezek. 28, 8, *cruel death*; עֲצוֹת Deut. 32, 28, *true counsel*.

Ps. 87, 3, נִכְבְּדוֹת *a most glorious thing*. Psalm 87 is a poem of the Dispersion. The underlying idea is that although the Jews are dispersed all over the world, still Zion continues to be the spiritual mother of them all. The original text of the Psalm is not well preserved, but Haupt has probably succeeded in restoring it. He believes that the Psalm began with 3a נִכְבְּדוֹת מִדְּבַר בָּךְ and regards עִיר אֱלֹהִים as a gloss to בָּךְ. The first stanza² of the Psalm reads, therefore, according to Haupt, as follows:

1b יסודתו בקררי קדש	3a נכבדות מדבר בך
מכל משכנות יעקב;	2 אוהב שערי ציון

A most glorious thing is spoken of thee,
His foundation on the great holy mountain.
God loveth the gates of Zion
Above all the dwellings of Jacob.³

For the pl. הררי cf. p. 198.

¹ Cf. S. Glassius, *Philologia Sacra*, col. 618, note on Ecc. 5, 6: *In multitudine somniorum vanitates*, h. e. *maxima vanitas*, הַבָּלִים

² The psalm must be divided into three stanzas, each stanza consisting of two *meshalim* or poetic lines; each *māshal* has two hemistichs, and each hemistich three beats.

³ Professor Haupt restored the original text of the psalm in connection with the interpretation of Messianic Psalms, in the Oriental Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University, during the session 1902-03.

F. Several Miscellaneous Examples of the 'Pluralis Intensus.

In Ecc. 7, 26 the pl. מִצּוּרִים 'snares' = A Great Snare, and the pl. חֲרָמִים 'nets' = A Great Net. Cf. Böttcher, *Ausführ. Lehr. d. hebr. Spr.*, vol. 1, p. 488.

In Prov. 7, 22, Haupt reads פְּתָאִים (plural of פֶּתַח 'simple') for פְּתָאִם, and renders it *this colossal simpleton, this arrant fool*. For a full discussion of this passage see Crit. Notes on Prov. (SBOT), p. 40, ll. 23 ff.

In several passages (Job 17, 1; 21, 23; 2 Chron. 16, 14) the pl. קְבָרִים = a great grave, i. e., a Mausoleum. Cf. Delitzsch, *Das Buch Hiob* (1902), p. 157, note on 17, 1.

Cf. the Ethiop. pl. *magäber* employed in a singular sense.

APPENDIX.

THE 'PLURALIS INTENSIVUS' IN RABBINICAL LITERATURE.

The 'intensive plural' is but rarely met with in Rabbinical Literature. The following, however, may be mentioned:

While in the OT the pl. בְּעָלִים is employed in a singular sense only with suffixes, in the Talmud it is used frequently also in the absolute state; cf., for instance, *Baba Kama*, 54a בעלים כל דאית ליה *everything that has an owner*; *ibid.*, 57a דעת בעלים *the knowledge of the owner*, etc.

The plurals מְרִיךְ and רְבוּנִין are occasionally employed in a singular sense, as equivalent to Heb. אֲדָרִים and בְּעָלִים,¹ e. g., Targum to Is. 1, 3 יָדַע הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲדָרִים וְהַמֶּלֶךְ יָדַע הַמֶּלֶךְ (בְּעָלִים = מְרִיחִי); cf. Gen. R., section 58 מֵאֲרִי בֵּיתָא *the owner (or master) of the house*, and Deut. R., section 2 אֲנִי מְרִיךְ דְּנַפְשִׁי *I am master of my desire*. In the Talmud מְרוֹתָא, commonly employed as a plural of מֵר, is sometimes used in a singular sense, like מְרִיךְ in the passages quoted above, e. g., *Baba Bathra*, 3b קְטַלְנָהּ לְכוּלָּהּ *he (Herod) killed all of his master's family*; *Baba Kama*, 103a דְּכִיתָנָא מֵר *the owner of the flask*; *ibid.* מְרוֹתָא דְּהַצֵּר *the owner of the court*. Compare Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi*, p. 834; Levy, *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, Vol. II, p. 234. Targum to Gen. 40, 1 לְרְבוּנִיהוֹן לְמַלְכָּא דְּמִצְרַיִם

¹ Cf. Winer, *Grammatik des biblischen und targumischen Chaldaismus* (Leipzig, 1824), p. 108, 3.

(לְרַבּוֹנֵיהֶֿם = לְאַדְנֵיהֶֿם) *to their lord, the King of Egypt*; cf. also Targum 1 Ki. **22**, 17; Ps. **136**, 3, and Targum Yerushalmi, Gen. **19**, 2; **42**, 33.

שְׁמַיִם (or Aram. שְׁמַיָּא) is a common name for God in Rabbinical Literature. Cf. *Pirke Aboth* **1**, 3; **4**, 12 (cf. ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν for ἡ βασιλεία του Θεοῦ in the New Testament; cf. also Matt. **23**, 22). It is intended as a plural of majesty on analogy of אֱלֹהִים. The plural שְׁמַיָּא as a name for God is found also in Dan. **4**, 3 (דִּי שַׁלְטַן שְׁמַיָּא *that heaven rules*), and probably also in Job **15**, 15.¹

Finally, we will mention Targ. to Jer. **15**, 8 חֵל יַמְּמִין (= Hebr. חֹל יָמִים) *the sand of the sea*; and Am. **3**, 9 עַל טוֹרֵי שְׁמִירוֹן (= Hebr. עַל הָרֵי שְׁמִירוֹן) *upon Mount Samaria*.

¹ Thus also 1 Macc. **4**, 10; **24**, 55. Cf. Shak., *All's Well that Ends Well*, III, 4, *her prayers, whom heaven delights to hear*.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

I, Aaron Ember, a Jew, was born in Tulnas, a country place in the government of Kowno, Russia, Dec. 25, 1878. In 1884 my parents removed to Kurshani, a small town in the same government, where I studied the Bible and the Talmud under different Rabbis until 1891. In that year I came with my parents to this country. I received my common school education in the public schools of Baltimore. I took the degree of Bachelor of Arts at the Johns Hopkins University in 1901. From 1901 to 1904 I pursued the study of Semitic Languages and Oriental History under Professor Haupt and Dr. Johnston. The degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred upon me in June, 1904.

